

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

1. Date of Submission: 2010-03-19 18:11:46

2. Agency: 010

3. Bureau: 00

4. Name of this Investment: E-DOI - Geospatial Line of Business (GeoLOB)

5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: 010-00-01-02-01-3100-24

6. What kind of investment will this be in FY 2011?: Multi-Agency Collaboration

- Planning
- Full Acquisition
- Operations and Maintenance
- Mixed Life Cycle
- Multi-Agency Collaboration

7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? *

8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap; this description may include links to relevant information which should include relevant GAO reports, and links to relevant findings of independent audits.

The Geospatial Line of Business will be in the strategic planning stages in FY07 - FY10, establishing the framework that will enable geospatial cooperation and investment across Federal programs. Through such cooperation, Federal programs can enhance their capacity to use and exchange geospatial/geospatially-derived data and information. Optimal use of geographic data and geo-analytics can significantly improve the way that governments conceptualize and execute strategic plans, manage organizations, and offer goods and services to the public. There are numerous geospatial efforts being conducted independently across Federal agencies, resulting in disparate data silos and services, investment opportunity losses and compromised business understanding. The Geo LoB recommends a set of common government-wide solutions that serve the Nation's interests, and the core missions of Federal agencies and their partners, through more effective and efficient development, provisioning, and interoperability of geospatial data and services. Building on the policy foundation of Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-16, and the President's Management Agenda, the Geo LoB will close performance gaps by developing a Federal operational framework for managing geospatial information across the government. This Federal operational framework will result in a more coordinated, collaborative, and leveraged approach to produce, maintain, and use geospatial data and services. The framework will also establish a system of accountability for all data stewards in the Federal geospatial environment. Future cost savings, and greater satisfaction of customer and business needs will be realized by optimizing; and where appropriate, consolidating geospatial assets and activities through enhanced performance accountability and compliance mechanisms and coordinated budget planning and cost avoidance strategies. This Joint Business Case, and the Geo LoB Common Solutions and Target Architecture document, lays out an initial six-year plan including the establishment of a Geospatial LoB Program Management Office (PMO) which began in FY2007. This Geo LoB PMO consists of contractor resources administered by the FGDC Secretariat. The FGDC Secretariat reports to the FGDC Steering Committee and the FGDC Coordination Group, which includes membership from all LoB partner agencies. Any and all FTE costs are absorbed by the program areas in the participating agencies.

- a. Provide here the date of any approved rebaselining within the past year, the date for the most recent (or planned) alternatives analysis for this investment, and whether this investment has a**

risk management plan and risk register.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? *

a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? *

10. Contact information of Program/Project Manager?

- **Name:** *
- **Phone Number:** *
- **Email:** *

11. What project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per FAC-P/PM)? *

- Project manager has been validated according to FAC-PMPM or DAWIA criteria as qualified for this investment.
- Project manager qualifications according to FAC-P/PM or DAWIA criteria is under review for this investment.
- Project manager assigned to investment, but does not meet requirements according to FAC-P/OM or DAWIA criteria.
- Project manager assigned but qualification status review has not yet started.
- No project manager has yet been assigned to this investment.

12. If this investment is a financial management system, then please fill out the following as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory (FMSI):

Financial management system name(s)	System acronym	Unique Project Identifier (UPI) number
*	*	*

a. If this investment is a financial management system AND the investment is part of the core financial system then select the primary FFMIA compliance area that this investment addresses (choose only one): *

- computer system security requirement;
- internal control system requirement;
- core financial system requirement according to FSIO standards;
- Federal accounting standard;
- U.S. Government Standard General Ledger at the Transaction Level;
- this is a core financial system, but does not address a FFMIA compliance area;
- Not a core financial system; does not need to comply with FFMIA

Section B: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

Table 1: SUMMARY OF FUNDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS) (Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY1 and earlier	PY 2009	CY 2010	BY 2011	BY+1 2012	BY+2 2013	BY+3 2014	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Acquisition:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Operations & Maintenance:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Disposition Costs (optional):	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
SUBTOTAL:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTAL(including FTE costs)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

2. If the summary of funding has changed from the FY 2010 President's Budget request, briefly explain those changes:

*

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

1.

Table 1: Contracts/Task Orders Table

Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start date of Contract/Task Order	End date of Contract/Task Order	Total Value of Contract/Task Order (M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N)
ING08HQFS0199	Firm Fixed	Y	2008-09-15	2008-09-15	2010-09-14	\$1.3	*	*	*	*	*

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

*

3. Is there an acquisition plan which reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements? *

a. If "yes," what is the date? *

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

Table 1: Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2011	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Percent of significant data sets fully defined with respect to geospatial data lifecycle	24%	36%	
2008	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Percent of A-16 National Significant Data Theme production priorities defined	0%	100%	100%
2007	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Percentage of tasks completed for realignment of the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) Steering Committee and Coordination Group	0%	5%	5%
2009	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Number of users defined data standards that contribute to A-16/Nationally Significant Data Themes.	0	1	1
2007	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Percent of Senior Agency Officials for Geospatial Information (SAOGIs) that concur with BY07 Joint Business case for Geospatial Governance	0%	90%	96% (All but 1 SAOGI concurred)
2008	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources	*	*	Percent of Senior Agency Officials for Geospatial Information (SAOGIs) that concur with	0%	90%	96%

Table 1: Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	Through Integrated			BY10 Joint Business case for Geospatial Governance			
2008	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Number of existing Federal software solutions made available for adoption across other Federal agencies	0	3	3
2008	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Percent of significant data sets fully defined with respect to the geospatial data lifecycle	0%	12%	12%
2007	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Percent completion of Draft Performance Management Plan	0%	100%	100%
2012	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Number of Best Practices (costs, schedule, and quality) defined within each of the 7 stages of the geospatial lifecycle	7	14	
2009	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Number of Best Practices (costs, schedule, and quality) defined within each of the 7 stages of the geospatial data lifecycle	0	7	7
2012	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding	*	*	Number of agencies or operating units sharing	0	5	

Table 1: Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
	of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated			geospatial data previously used only by data-producing agency			
2011	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Number of agencies or operating units sharing geospatial data perviously used only by data-producing agency	0	5	
2008	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Number of best practices articles coordinated, developed, and disseminated that encourage Federal executives to geo-enable agency programs	0	2	2
2009	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Number of best practices articles coordinated, developed, and disseminated that encourage Federal executives to geo-enable agency programs	2	2	2
2008	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Percent completion of the definition of the geospatial data lifecycle stages, processes, technology, and practices	0%	100%	100%
2011	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Number of Best Practices (costs, schedule, and quality) defined withing each of the 7 stages of the geospatial lifecycle	7	14	

Table 1: Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2012	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Percent of significant data sets fully defined with respect to geospatial data lifecycle	24	36	
2012	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Number of Best Practices articles coordinated, developed, and disseminated that encourage Federal Executives to geo-enable agency programs	2	2	
2009	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Completion of two Federal Government-wide Enterprise License Agreements	0	2	BPA in place by end of FY 2009
2011	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Number of Best Practices articles coordinated, developed, and disseminated that encourage Federal Executives to geo-enable agency programs	2	2	
2009	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Percent of significant data sets fully defined with respect to geospatial data lifecycle	12%	24%	26%
2007	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through	*	*	Percent completion of Joint Business Case for GeoLoB by working 26 partner agencies	0%	100%	100%

Table 1: Performance Information Table

Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
Integrated							
2008	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Percentage of tasks completed for realignment of the Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) Steering Committee and Coordination Group	0%	100%	100%
2010	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Number of Best Practices (costs, schedule, and quality) defined within each of the 7 stages of the geospatial lifecycle	7	14	15
2010	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Number of Best Practices articles coordinated, developed, and disseminated that encourage Federal Executives to geo-enable agency programs	2	2	2
2010	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Percent of significant data sets fully defined with respect to geospatial data lifecycle	24%	36%	36%
2010	Resource Protection: Improve the Understanding of National Ecosystems and Resources Through Integrated Interdisciplinary Assessment.	*	*	Number of agencies or operating units sharing geospatial data previously used only by data-producing agency	0	5	0

Part IV: Planning For "Multi-Agency Collaboration" ONLY

Section A: Multi-Agency Collaboration Oversight (All Capital Assets)

1. Stakeholder Table:

Partner Agency	Joint exhibit approval date
*	*

2. Partner Capital Assets within this Investment:

Partner Agency	Partner Agency Asset Title	Partner Agency Exhibit 53 UPI (BY 2011)
*	*	*

3. Partner Funding Strategies (\$millions):

Partner Agency	Partner exhibit 53 UPI (BY 2011)	CY Contribution	CY Fee-for-Service	BY Contribution	BY Fee-for-Service
*	*	*	*	*	*

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this investment? *
- a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed? *
- b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed? *
- c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:
- *

2. Does this investment replace any legacy systems investments? Disposition costs (costs of retirement of legacy systems) may be included as a category in Part I, Section B, Summary of Funding, or in separate investments, classified as major or non-major. For legacy system investments being replaced by this investment, include the following data on these legacy investments.

4. Legacy Systems Being Replaced

Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement
*	*	*

3. For Multi-Agency Investments, Cost and Schedule Milestone table should be completed in the same format as Part II Section A and Part III Section A, above. NOTE: The Ex 300 schema includes an optional Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) field that is not depicted in the table below.

5. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline

Description of Milestones	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
Develop Communications approach for cross agency investment strategy for data use and use within a geo-enabling business	\$0.1	\$0.0	2009-10-01	2009-10-01	2010-09-30		100.00%	25.00%

5. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline								
Description of Milestones	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
framework								
Develop and Implement common grants language for Geospatial information and services	\$0.2	\$0.2	2009-01-02	2009-01-02	2009-12-29	2009-12-29	100.00%	100.00%
Update requirements and make recommendations to the CIO Council to ensure Federal-wide support for the technology and telecommunications infrastructure required to deliver geospatial services	\$0.0	\$0.0	2009-10-01	2009-10-01	2010-09-30		100.00%	25.00%
Execute Communications Plans	\$0.1	\$0.1	2009-01-05	2009-01-05	2009-06-30	2009-06-30	100.00%	100.00%
Review component themes of A-16 and reconcile user needs	\$0.3	\$0.3	2008-09-15	2008-09-15	2009-07-01	2009-05-01	100.00%	100.00%
Develop and implement geospatial requirements language for Federal contracts (e.g., FAR, DFAR)	\$0.0	\$0.0	2008-01-02	2008-01-02	2008-12-30	2008-12-30	100.00%	100.00%
PMO Planning / Project Planning and Support	\$0.4	\$0.4	2008-09-12	2008-09-12	2009-09-11	2009-09-11	100.00%	100.00%
Develop outreach programs to demonstrate value of Geospatial technology	\$0.1	\$0.1	2008-10-01	2008-10-01	2009-03-30	2009-03-30	100.00%	100.00%
Develop and implement common grants language for geospatial information	\$0.0	\$0.0	2008-01-02	2008-01-02	2008-12-29	2008-12-29	100.00%	100.00%

5. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline								
Description of Milestones	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
and services								
Refine the A-16 Supplemental Guidance to better address portfolio management	\$0.5	\$0.5	2009-12-08	2009-12-08	2010-03-01	2010-05-11	100.00%	100.00%
Validate analysis of all agency cross-government licensing requirements (e.g. options, constraints, etc)	\$0.0	\$0.0	2007-12-03	2007-12-03	2008-09-30	2008-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Deliver Common Services Documentation	\$0.0	\$0.0	2007-12-03	2007-12-03	2008-03-31	2008-03-31	100.00%	100.00%
Prepare FY2012 Exhibit 300 (business case) and budget request for the IFTN Project	\$0.1	\$0.1	2010-01-08	2010-01-08	2010-04-01		100.00%	80.00%
Evaluate existing geospatial data lifecycle frameworks, develop standard terminology and processes for the stages of the geospatial data lifecycle and establish data steward responsibilities and performance measures.	\$0.1	\$0.1	2008-10-01	2008-10-01	2009-09-30	2009-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Develop Enterprise Agreement requirements document (Statement of Work)	\$0.1	\$0.0	2009-10-28	2009-10-28	2010-07-14		100.00%	45.00%
Update Geo LoB Communications Plan	\$0.0	\$0.0	2007-12-21	2007-12-21	2008-09-30	2008-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Review opportunities to expand	\$0.0	\$0.0	2008-10-01	2008-10-01	2009-09-30	2009-09-30	100.00%	100.00%

5. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline								
Description of Milestones	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
SmartBUY								
Revise governance structure that supports programs including: Geospatial One-Stop, Place Based Initiatives, and Imagery for the Nation (IFTN)	\$0.2	\$0.1	2010-01-08	2010-01-08	2010-04-01		100.00%	60.00%
Develop draft Geospatial Segment Architecture guidance	\$0.1	\$0.1	2010-01-04	2010-01-04	2010-09-15		100.00%	90.00%
Define geospatial data lifecycle stages to include: common terminology, practices, and procedures and propose how to reconcile terms under key Federal documents such as the LOB, CSTA, A-130, and FEA	\$0.1	\$0.1	2008-01-02	2008-01-02	2008-06-30	2008-06-30	100.00%	100.00%
Develop a government wide criteria for establishing priority data sets (criteria includes: mission/congressional, stakeholders, cost share/ROI and critical infrastructure)	\$0.0	\$0.0	2008-02-19	2008-02-19	2008-07-31	2008-07-31	100.00%	100.00%
Develop requirements and make recommendations to the CIO Council to ensure Federal –wide support for the technology and telecommunic	\$0.0	\$0.0	2008-02-04	2008-02-04	2009-09-30	2009-09-30	100.00%	100.00%

5. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline								
Description of Milestones	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
ations infrastructure required to deliver geospatial services.								
Exhibit 300 update and delivery	\$0.0	\$0.0	2007-12-03	2007-12-03	2008-09-08	2008-09-08	100.00%	100.00%
Deliver gap analysis for A-16 data development	\$0.0	\$0.0	2008-10-01	2008-10-01	2009-09-29	2009-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
E-300 EVM Reporting and Pass-back update	\$0.0	\$0.0	2007-11-15	2007-11-15	2009-01-14	2009-01-14	100.00%	100.00%
PMO Planning / Project Planning and Support	\$0.3	\$0.2	2007-09-12	2007-09-12	2008-09-11	2008-09-11	100.00%	100.00%
Based on identification of the most significant data sets for each theme, quantitatively assess opportunities to capture efficiencies in development and maintenance (cost, schedule, and quality) of lifecycle stages on a government-wide basis	\$0.0	\$0.0	2008-10-01	2008-10-01	2009-09-30	2009-09-30	0.00%	0.00%
Develop and implement geospatial requirements language for Federal contracts (e.g., FAR, DFAR)	\$0.1	\$0.1	2009-01-02	2009-01-02	2009-12-30	2009-12-30	100.00%	100.00%
Develop requirements and make recommendations to the CIO Council to ensure Federal-wide support for the technology and telecommunic	\$0.0	\$0.0	2008-02-04	2008-02-04	2009-09-30	2009-09-30	100.00%	100.00%

5. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline								
Description of Milestones	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
ations infrastructure to deliver Geospatial services.								
Manage GLOB Performance	\$0.3	\$0.2	2007-07-02	2007-07-02	2008-09-30	2008-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Release Annual A-16 themes/data steward report	\$0.0	\$0.0	2008-07-01	2008-10-01	2009-03-31	2009-03-31	100.00%	100.00%
Capture lessons learned from CAP Grant Process	\$0.0	\$0.0	2007-12-02	2007-12-02	2008-08-29	2008-08-29	100.00%	100.00%
Establish Geo=Cloud Initiative Prototype	\$0.2	\$0.1	2009-11-02	2009-11-02	2010-06-25		100.00%	50.00%
Exhibit 300 update	\$0.1	\$0.1	2008-10-01	2008-10-01	2009-09-09	2009-09-09	100.00%	100.00%
Review component themes of A-16 and reconcile user needs	\$0.0	\$0.0	2007-07-02	2007-07-02	2008-09-30	2008-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Survey other agencies (DOD, USGS, HSIP, HIFLD, PSI, DHS/COD, SDSFIE, etc.) to identify any data sets relevant to these data themes, and develop process for determining authoritative data sets across requirements lists	\$0.2	\$0.1	2008-01-02	2008-01-02	2008-09-30	2008-09-30	100.00%	100.00%
Identify, Prioritize, and follow up on each A-16 data theme	\$0.1	\$0.1	2008-01-02	2008-01-02	2008-06-30	2008-06-30	100.00%	100.00%
Revise FY11 Exhibit 300 Passback	\$0.0	\$0.0	2008-10-01	2009-02-01	2010-01-14	2010-01-14	100.00%	100.00%
Develop outreach programs to demonstrate the value of "location	\$0.0	\$0.0	2007-12-03	2007-12-03	2008-09-30	2008-09-30	100.00%	100.00%

5. Comparison of Actual Work Completed and Actual Costs to Current Approved Baseline								
Description of Milestones	Planned Cost (\$M)	Actual Cost (\$M)	Planned Start Date	Actual Start Date	Planned Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Planned Percent Complete	Actual Percent Complete
based" approaches and geospatial technology								
Draft 2CFR language to aid agencies to accomplish A-16 requirements	\$0.1	\$0.0	2009-10-01	2009-10-01	2010-09-02		100.00%	45.00%
Deliver lexicon of A-16 data lifecycle stages	\$0.0	\$0.0	2007-10-01	2007-10-01	2008-06-30	2008-06-30	100.00%	100.00%

* - Indicates data is redacted.